



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/313,436	05/17/1999	DAVID S. SPRINGER	M-7260US	3911

7590 12/31/2003

DAVID L MCCOMBS
HAYNES & BOONE LLP
901 MAIN STREET
SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER

LE, KHANH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/313,436

Applicant(s)

SPRINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh H. Le

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action/ Response to 2nd RCE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 , dated October 10, 2003, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 15, 2003 has been entered.

2. As requested, amendments to claims 1, 4-9, and 26 have been entered. Claims 1, 4-9, and 26 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 26 are independent.

Claims Objections

3. Previous objection to claim 8 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Previous rejections of Claims 1, 4-9 and 26 are withdrawn.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 1, is rejected because of a lack of antecedent basis: claim 1 refers to “information specific to a computer user” while claim 9 refers to “information unique to a computer user”. Correction is required to avoid confusion. Here, “unique” is interpreted as “specific” for prior art application purposes.

Response to Remarks

5. The prior art applied has been modified in view of the amendments therefore Applicants' arguments are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1, 4, 8-9, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardenswartz et al., US 6298,330 B1, hereinafter Gardenswartz in view of Jenkins, US 6285983, hereinafter Jenkins.

As to claims 1, 8, GARDENSWARTZ discloses:

A method of tracking information provided to a computer system from an advertisement database and associated server the method comprising:

providing an identifier unique to the computer system,

(see at least Figs. 3, 7, and associated text; col. lines. 2 ll. 9-20; col. 8 ll. 34-55: cookies and other ID methods);

the database associating the identifier (cookie) with information specific to a computer user associated with the computer system (see at least Figure 3 and associated text: "CID's").

the computer user establishing a web connection with the server (see at least Fig. 9 and associated text; col. 13 line 54+) and

the computer user transmitting the identifier to the database (Fig. 9 and associated text; col. 13 line 54+ ; col. 10 line 66- col. 11 l. 25)

in response the database transmitting a specific advertisements to the identified computer system (see at least Fig. 9 and associated text; col. 13 line 54+).

GARDENSWARTZ impliedly discloses the database tracking each advertisement transmitted to the identified computer system for monitoring follow-up purchasing behavior (col.15 lines 24-33).

However, GARDENSWARTZ does not specifically disclose tracking of the ads is for monitoring advertising revenue generated by the user.

However, the recited statement of intended use, to monitor advertising revenue generated by the user, does not patentably distinguish the claimed system from the system of GARDENSWARTZ because the subjective interpretation of the tracked ad data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention which performs the same steps as the system of GARDENSWARTZ.

GARDENSWARTZ does not specifically disclose the identifier is stored on a (the user's) hard drive (claim 8) or is imbedded in the user computer hardware (claim 1) however Jenkins discloses that

"As is known in the art, cookie files may be installed by a web site server on the computer hard disk drive of a browsing consumer" (see at least col. 1 lines 18-39). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to install the cookie file on the user hard drive to implement the user ID method of GARDENSWARTZ because such cookie implementation technique is well-known (typical) as stated in Jenkins.

Claim 4. GARDENSWARTZ discloses the method of claim 1 and further discloses the server hosting advertisements and informational data (see at least the abstract, col 7 l. 20-26: advertisements are also informational data).

(Per whatis.com, hosting is defined as :

http://searchwebservices.techtarget.com/sDefinition/0,,sid26_gci213581,00.html

“Hosting (also known as *Web site hosting*, *Web hosting*, and *Webhosting*) is the business of housing, serving, and maintaining files for one or more Web sites”).

Claim 9. The method of Claim 1 wherein information unique to the computer user includes one of incentives, bonuses and discounts on a plurality of goods (Fig 4b and associated text; col. 9 ll.27-64: specific target messages).

Claim 26 essentially claims the same steps as claim 1 in broader terms and is rejected similarly.

8. Claims 5,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardenswartz in view of Jenkins and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5855008, hereinafter Goldhaber.

Claim 5. GARDENSWARTZ discloses the method of claim 1 and further discloses the database searching and locating targeted advertisements (see at least Figure 9 and associated text). GARDENSWARTZ also discloses criteria provided by the computer user during a querying procedure (see at least Fig. 7 and associated text; col.11 lines 39-53:” product brand preferences”).

However GARDENSWARTZ does not specifically disclose the database searching and locating advertisements that match criteria provided by the computer user during a querying procedure. Goldhaber discloses such however (see at least Figure 11A and associated text; col. 15 lines 1 to col. 16 lines 24-47). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3622

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add such ad matching as taught by Goldhaber to the GARDENSWARTZ's system to satisfy the user's interests as taught by Goldhaber (col.14 lines 65-66).

Claim 7. GARDENSWARTZ discloses the method of claim 5 and further discloses the database checks for the identifier_(Fig. 9 item 80 and associated text: matching cookie number to consumer ID implies checking the identifier for accuracy before the matching step; col. 13 line 54+ ; col. 10 line 66- col. 11 l. 25).

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardenswartz in view of Jenkins and Goldhaber, and further in view of Day et al., US 5857175 A, hereinafter Day.

As to Claim 6. GARDENSWARTZ in view of Goldhaber discloses the method of claim 5 but does not disclose if no matching criteria is found the database transmitting one of generic advertisements or no advertisements. However, Day discloses same (col. 5 lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add such feature of Day into the GARDENSWARTZ/Goldhaber system to keep the user interested in the ad delivery system (Day, col.5 line 41).

Conclusion

10. All prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Note: **Griffiths et al, and Roth**, alone, or in combination with other well-known methods, could be used to reject most claims.

Art Unit: 3622

Griffiths et al, US 6286045 B1 discloses a banner ads display monitoring method/system, where storage of the ads can be on many databases, including user computer local database, as convenient, and separate ad broker/server.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh H. Le whose telephone number is 703-305-0571. The Examiner works a part-time schedule and can best be reached on Tuesday-Wednesday 9:00-6:00. The examiner can also be reached at the e-mail address: khanh.le2@uspto.gov. (However, Applicants are cautioned that confidentiality of email communications cannot be assured.)

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

December 12, 2003

KHL



JAMES W. MYHRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER